UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/500
S/1996/854
15 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-first session
Agenda item 58
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-first year

Letter dated 10 October 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 9 October 1996, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Osman Ertuğ, representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the enclosed letter and its annex, which contains a letter of His Excellency Mr. Rauf R. Denktaş, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, dated 22 September 1996, sent to Mr. Glafcos Clerides, the leader of the Greek Cypriot Community (see appendix), would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 58, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hüseyin E. ÇELEM
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

96-27677 (E) 161096 171096

/...

ANNEX

Letter dated 9 October 1996 from Mr. Osman Ertuğ
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith an abridged version of the letter dated 22 September 1996 addressed by H.E. Rauf Denktaş, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, to Mr. Glafcos Clerides, the leader of the Greek Cypriot Community, in response to the latter's letter dated 11 September 1996.

I shall be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 58, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman ERTUĞ
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

APPENDIX

Letter dated 22 September 1996 from Mr. Rauf R. Denktaş addressed to Mr. Glafcos Clerides

This is in reply to your letter of 11 September 1996 in which, very significantly, the non-committal ending of "Yours, etc." was omitted. I wish to state my thoughts and feelings, most sincerely, on some aspects of the Cyprus problem because I feel that Greek Cypriot exertions are leading us in the opposite direction of a negotiated settlement.

My repeated calls, over the years, for face-to-face talks for a negotiated settlement on the basis of the parameters put forward by the Secretary-General of the United Nations have constantly been ignored on the ground that there is no "common basis" for negotiations.

For us the reason for this course of action by your side is quite clear: the Greek Cypriot leadership would rather retain the title of "the Government of Cyprus" than "condescend" to share power with the Turkish Cypriot ex-partner on a new basis! Hence an "admirable" way of changing the agenda each time, while all concerned are made to believe that the Greek Cypriot side has the political will to reach a new partnership agreement while the Turkish Cypriot side runs away from it. We experienced this in 1984-1985, then in 1986 with the proposals put to us by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and then again, in 1992-1993 with the United Nations Set of Ideas and the Confidence-Building Measures. That Makarios' "will and testament" to the Greek Cypriot leadership still guides your way is quite clear to us. Makarios is on record for proudly confessing that he had brought Cyprus to the nearest point to Enosis by destroying the partnership Republic in 1963 and by presenting to the world an administration composed 100 per cent of Greek Cypriots as "the Government of Cyprus".

Indeed you have been truthful enough to state in your memoirs "My deposition", volume 3, page 105, that "the Greek Cypriot preoccupation was that Cyprus should be a Greek Cypriot State, with a protected Turkish Cypriot minority" and that "the Turkish preoccupation was to defeat any such effort and to maintain the partnership concept".

Hence the continuous attempt to consolidate your position against us as "the Government of Cyprus"; forcing on us your false title, while maintaining the illegal and immoral embargoes against us; the signing of the defence doctrine with Greece; the build-up of arms; the encouragement of a policy (which runs contrary to the High-Level Agreements and all the parameters on the table) of redeeming "every house, every village, every hamlet, etc.", with your promises to all Greek Cypriots to return to their lands as a precondition for a settlement, when you well know that no Turkish Cypriot will return to the South to suffer the indignities and harassment of the 1963-1974 period.

In October 1994 the Secretary-General of the United Nations had invited us to face-to-face talks with his letter of 10 October 1994, the relevant paragraph of which reads:

"I have asked my Deputy Special Representative, Mr. Feissel, to invite you and Mr. Clerides to join him for a number of informal consultations at his residence with a view to exploring in a practical and concrete manner ways in which progress might be made both in respect of the implementation of the Confidence-Building Measures and the long-contemplated overall settlement of the Cyprus problem."

This time you found the excuse of membership in the European Union (EU) for changing the agenda by asking me to agree to support your unlawful and unilateral application for membership as a precondition for continuing the dialogue.

Your assessment that EU countries have been adequately hoodwinked (or blackmailed by Greece) to believe that "Cyprus" is politically and economically ready to be accepted as a member of the EU - even though there is no solution at hand, and in the absence of Turkish Cypriot consent - has encouraged your side to turn its back on the whole process of a negotiated settlement.

Now I notice that your refusal to treat us (your ex-co-founder partner of the 1960 Republic) as your sole interlocutor at the inter-communal talks is aimed at showing the rest of the world that the Cyprus problem is not an inter-communal conflict, but it is a problem between Turkey and Cyprus and that the world should help you solve it on that basis! You may well afford to forget the years between 1963 and 1974, but forgetfulness is no excuse for running away with Cyprus and abrogating our vested rights.

Can we forget that the Cyprus problem was originated by your side when you tried to amend the Constitution of Cyprus in order to abrogate our vested rights as a co-founder partner of the Republic? It takes no great imagination on our part to know how "the major cards" will be played against us once you enter the EU.

Your spokesman, Yannakis Kasulides, is also on record as stating on 14 November 1993 in the Periodiko journal that once Cyprus becomes a member of the EU, even if Turkey had the right of unilateral intervention in Cyprus, it would not be able to exercise such a right against a country which is a member of the EU. He also stated that the linkage and integration between members of the EU go beyond economic integration and embrace such areas as common foreign and defence policy; hence your defence doctrine with Greece attempting to replace the guarantee system of 1960! How can you expect us to fall into these Hellenistic traps?

Our position on EU membership is quite clear: Cyprus, which has been divided since 1963, can only evolve into a one-Cyprus State again through a negotiated settlement, before it can have the mandate from its component peoples for applying to the EU for membership, and it can do so only within the limits accorded to it by the 1960 Agreements. There has not been a legitimate "Government of Cyprus" representing the two politically equal communities since 1963.

It is in this light that I read and evaluated your letter of 17 December 1993 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on

demilitarization which you attached to your letter under reply. That you signed it as "the President of Cyprus" is as irrelevant to the Cyprus dispute as its contents, at this stage. The crux of the inter-communal dispute is the attempt of the Greek Cypriot side to impose itself on us as "the Government of Cyprus" contrary to the rule of law and in complete disregard of the "state of affairs" created by the 1960 Treaties, which gave certain rights to each of the interested parties, namely Turkish Cypriots, Turkey, Greek Cypriots, Greece and, of course, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. This balanced distribution of rights and obligations was necessary in view of the facts on the ground and the nature of the inter-communal conflict preceding the 1959-1960 accord. Cyprus had to be protected from destroying itself in the name of Enosis or partition. Hence, the balance and equality struck between the two motherlands vis-à-vis Cyprus and the respective communities, and the dictum that the two communities are politically equal partners, neither of them having the right to dominate the other. As the threat to this partnership Republic from within was a permanent threat (in view of the Enosis movement and the persistent belief that Cyprus is a land of Hellenes in which Turkish Cypriots have no place), it was necessary to evolve a permanent guarantee system. Hence, the Treaties of Guarantee and of Alliance and the consequential restrictions on the right of Cyprus to unite with any other country, in whole or in part, and to enter any union in which both motherland guarantors are not members.

The consequence of this wise approach was the veto rights given to each community in order to avert such indirect Enosis, which you are now trying to achieve through the EU.

It is clear to all students of the Cyprus problem that the Greek Cypriot attempt to convert Cyprus into a Greek Cypriot Republic has not ceased and that the unilateral application for EU membership has been made in order to "sign, seal and deliver" Cyprus into Greek Cypriot hands, in complete disregard of the Treaty right of the other interested parties. What Makarios tried to do by attacking us, you are now trying to complete through the EU, believing that the EU will declare the Treaties of 1960 as invalid, especially the guarantee system established under them. Your letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on demilitarization is a clever ruse in that direction.

Your continued attempt to change the guarantee system of 1960 gives us no confidence for the future. We cannot afford to change a system which was meant to prevent you, and finally did prevent you, from doing to us and to Cyprus what you have done from 1963 to 1974. Our future coexistence (if it is wanted) must rest on this permanent system of guarantee because the danger to Cyprus continues to exist from within and there is no assurance that this state of affairs, this mentality that Cyprus is Greek or Hellene, will ever change unless the impossible is achieved: the Church abandons its adventurous policy; the Greek Cypriot education system stops poisoning the youth against Turkey and us; and the "Megali Idea" is abandoned.

It is in this context that the events of 11 August 1996 and thereafter, resulting in the deaths of three young men (two Greek Cypriots and one Turkish Cypriot, with another Turkish Cypriot fighting for his life in hospital), have to be judged.

The fact that the motorcyclists' demonstration was organized with the approval and financial support of your administration, and that of the Church, needs no further proof other than statements made by you and your authorities, including Church leaders. But just for the record I wish to quote from an interview of the President of the Greek Cypriot Motorcyclists Federation as reported in the Periodiko journal on 21 August 1996:

> "... Mr. Kasulides had promised us 10,000 Cyprus pounds from state funds to help us finance demonstrations ... Furthermore, we were promised that the Greek Army would provide us transport to Germany in a Herkules transport plane of the Greek Air Force."

That these pre-planned demonstrations were conceived and executed in a violent and provocative manner cannot be disputed. The slogans used were a direct threat to our very existence and a violation of each and every concept on which a federal structure could be established. You cannot, in defiance of the mutually agreed principles of bi-zonality and bi-communality, claim the right of return to your homes and property without threatening Turkish Cypriots who were forced to abandon all their properties in the South and who do not wish to return having not forgotten the days of harassment and indignity through which they went for 11 years. That is why we agreed on a future set-up based on bi-zonality and that is why we agreed to curtail "the three freedoms" (of movement, settlement and property ownership) in order to establish a viable bi-zonal solution. Disputing this principle is ample proof of your policy of discarding a federal solution.

Had you not supported the demonstrations, had you taken those precautions on the first day, and had you prevented Greek Cypriots from attacking the buffer zone and personnel of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), there would have been no injuries, no deaths and no killings in revenge by Greek commandos, as admitted now by publications in Greece, and I quote: "The attack of 8 September against the Turks was done by Greek Commandos in order to revenge the killings of 11 and 14 August 1996" (from a report in the Stohos newspaper, published in Greece, based on a pamphlet distributed in Limassol on 16 September 1996).

The oath of vengeance in the so-called "National Guard" camps on 15 August 1996 "to drink Turkish blood" should have alerted you to the fact that something was amiss and that you should have taken measures to stop such commando raids on our sentries. Nothing was done and Turkish blood was thus drunk by Greek commandos! And as I am writing this letter to you today (22 September 1996) we see in your daily press that T-shirts are being sold in your army camps depicting slogans to the effect that they are hungry and thirsty for Turkish blood. What "healthy" ground you are all preparing for a future settlement!

It is our responsibility as the two leaders of our communities to curb down feelings of vengeance and not to upset the equilibrium established under the Guarantee System of 1960. To my people who escaped the above-described atrocities only by virtue of the Guarantee System, you cannot advocate a new guarantee system and hope that it will be accepted.

If coexistence is to be the essence of a future settlement, you should not play with the idea that the 1960 Guarantee System "did not work and has to be changed". The system was established in order to prevent exactly what you had set out to do and did to us from 1963 to 1974.

On the Treaty of Guarantee, I would like to repeat that a unilateral intervention under article 4 would never have arisen is everyone had played their part as they had undertaken to do. You did not merely fail to play your part as the Greek Cypriot wing of a bi-communal Government, but you set out to destroy what was guaranteed and with it to destroy the Turkish Community. So what legitimate right have you got to complain that the Guarantee System has failed you?

As lawyers we both know that accusations and pictures on videos by themselves prove little or nothing unless corroborated by real evidence.

It appears that practically all Turks that you guessed or suspected to be in the vicinity of the events of 11 and 14 August 1996, without mention of your provocations and incitements, have been lined up for accusation. The list of names given by you is not sustained by facts or the pictures. I could give you a similar list putting down the names of all who have caused, provoked and incited the events of 11 and 14 August 1996.

All I can say is that on some of the photographs produced, there are indications of "doctoring" through computers, and names mentioned by you do not match the actual pictures.

It is upon us, the leadership, to tell our peoples that there is no other way in Cyprus except coexistence as good neighbours under separate roofs or as co-founder partners under one mutually agreed bi-zonal, bi-communal roof. Rushing to our borders and claiming the right to come and sweep us off our properties and demanding submission to brute force, waving Greek flags and telling us that Hellenism will be victorious in Cyprus, are surely not the way to a negotiated settlement.

As regards your allegation that I have drawn the premature conclusion that the killing of a Turkish Cypriot soldier and the wounding of another on 8 September 1996 was a revenge killing by the Greek Cypriot side, I again feel obliged to remind you of the above-quoted passage from the Stohos newspaper, published in Greece.

Your reminder that in 1975 the murderer of two young mothers and their three minor children was arrested, tried and sentenced to death, that his sentence was reduced to life and that he served part of his sentence has nothing to do with the events of 11 and 14 August 1996, and of 8 September 1996. This was a case where two young mothers had paid 200 Cyprus pounds per person (1,000 Cyprus pounds in all) to this Greek Cypriot driver to be taken to the Turkish Cypriot sector to freedom and liberation in order to escape the harassment of 11 years under Greek Cypriot domination. Your position was that no Greek Cypriot could move from North to South and no Turkish Cypriot could move from South to North, thus forcing our people to resort to such secret ways for coming to liberty in the North, while forcing your people to stay put in

North Cyprus, contrary to their wishes and for the sake of your political expediency. Many more Turkish Cypriots perished on their way to the North until we made the Exchange of Population Agreement in Vienna in 1975. As to the murderer who had killed the young mother and her children, it is significant that when he was arrested he echoed a surprise by saying: "But they were Turks!" If my memory serves me right, he was reprieved after serving for a short time and later died in mysterious circumstances.

I feel that a period of confidence-building is needed so that we can test each other's sincerity for re-union. A period of time is needed for your side to tell the youth that today's division of the island is not our doing but is the result of Greek Cypriot attempts to convert Cyprus into a Greek Cypriot Republic by abrogating all Turkish Cypriot rights as a politically equal community and, therefore, that the exchange of properties is a sine qua non of any settlement so that the Greek Cypriot claim of a right to return will mellow down.

We have repeatedly presented to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, both orally and in writing, our views regarding a settlement, but we have no knowledge of what your side wants except that you want the guarantee system to be watered down or abrogated or replaced by a multinational force; the existence of the Greek Cypriot usurped "Government of Cyprus" to be acknowledged; and all Turkish troops to leave the island even before a settlement, forgetting the timetable on which the Secretary-General worked, with the consent of both sides, in developing his parameters. You also want our equality not to be on par with your equality but something less, while according to you, we have no sovereign rights at all although we point to the Swiss model on this point, thus disproving your allegation that we are after creating three sovereignties in the island!

In the light of the above, and in view of the fact that, before it is too late, we have to reverse the present dangerous trend of escalation, please let us know, openly and sincerely and as early as possible, how you see any future settlement so that we can evaluate our position correctly.

(Signed) Rauf. R. DENKTAŞ

S/1996/855

Readex
Fiche

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/511*
S/1996/855
16 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-first session
Agenda item 39
THE SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-first year

Letter dated 16 October 1996 from the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from the Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, I have the honour to submit the following as the recently adopted position of the Supreme Military Council for the Defence of Afghanistan pertaining to the current extremely tense situation in and around Kabul, the capital.

The Supreme Military Council for the Defence of Afghanistan, while having the ability to enter and liberate the capital city of Kabul, is avoiding entering the city in order to prevent civilian casualties and further destruction of the capital, and declares the following:

The Islamic State of Afghanistan would observe an immediate ceasefire under the following conditions:

1. The Taliban forces must evacuate the capital immediately.

2. Their heavy weapons must be withdrawn to a distance further than the range of their heavy artillery.

3. Kabul must be recognized as a demilitarized zone.

4. A police force should be formed under the supervision of the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference to ensure the security of Kabul.

5. Negotiations should start to pave the way for the formation of an interim government of national unity in the capital city of Kabul.

It is my earnest expectation that you will instruct Dr. Norbert Holl, the head of the United Nations Special Mission for Afghanistan, to undertake immediate consultations, on your behalf, towards obtaining the consent of the Taliban to avoid further complication of the situation.

I deem it necessary for you to also use your good offices and exert efforts aimed at bringing about appropriate pressure on the Taliban through their supporters to secure a general agreement on the proposed ceasefire.

I request you to instruct that the present letter be distributed as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 39, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Abdul Rahim GHAFOORZAI
Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs